

23i. Total program year pre-discount amount ( 23e + 23h): \$10,575.60
23j. % discount (from Block 4): 90
23k. Funding Commitment Request ( 23i x 23j): \$9,518.04

---

**Block 6: Certifications and Signature**

---

24a. Schools: Y

24b. Libraries or Library Consortia: N

26a. Individual Technology Plan: N

26b. Higher-Level Technology Plan(s): Y

26c. No Technology Plan Needed:

27a. Approved Technology Plan(s): Y

27b. State Approved Technology Plan: N

27c. No Technology Plan Needed:



---

**1997 - 2004 © , Universal Service Administrative Company, All Rights Reserved**

---

# Attachment 3



**COPY**  
Universal Service Administrative Company  
Schools & Libraries Division

**Administrator's Decision on Appeal - Funding Year 2003-2004**

September 24, 2004

Robert Rivera  
Spectrum Communications  
226 North Lincoln Avenue  
Corona, CA 92882

**RECEIVED**  
SEP 28 2004

RE: Rosemead Elementary School District

Re:      Billed Entity Number:            143604  
         471 Application Number:        366569  
         Funding Request Number(s):    996581, 996585, 996593  
         Your Correspondence Dated:    June 21, 2004

After thorough review and investigation of all relevant facts, the Schools and Libraries Division ("SLD") of the Universal Service Administrative Company ("USAC") has made its decision regarding your appeal of SLD's Year 2003 Funding Commitment Decision for the application number indicated above. This letter explains the basis of SLD's decision. The date of this letter begins the 60-day period for appealing this decision to the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC"). If your letter of appeal included more than one application number, please note that for each application an appeal is submitted, a separate letter is sent.

Funding Request Number:        996581, 996585, 996593  
Decision on Appeal:            **Denied in full**  
Explanation:

- On appeal, you seek reversal of the SLD's decision to deny the funding request for competitive bidding violations. In support of your request, you state that the only conclusion that can be drawn is that the Year 6 Form 471 for Rosemead School District is a "re-bid" for Year 5; however, this action does not constitute a bidding violation. Spectrum Communications simply responded to a solicitation generated by Rosemead's filing of their Form 470 for their request of Internal Connections and was awarded eight of the eleven E-rate projects. Therefore, you assert that the PRNs were erroneously denied and respectfully request reconsideration of the application.

- Upon thorough review of your appeal, it is determined that Rosemead School District's Form 470 displays striking similarities with the Form 470 of other applicants who selected Spectrum Communications as the service provider. Such similarities indicate that the vendor was improperly involved in the competitive bidding process, which is a competitive bidding violation. On appeal, you fail to show that the SLD erred in its initial determination. Consequently, your appeal is denied.
- FCC rules require applicants to submit an FCC Form 470 to USAC for posting on its website. 47 C.F.R. § 54.504(b). The FCC requires applicants to "submit a complete description of the services they seek so that it may be posted for competing service providers to evaluate." Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, CC Docket No. 96-45, Report and Order, FCC 97-157, 570 (rel. May 8, 1997) (Universal Service Order). The FCC requires "the application to describe the services that the schools and libraries seek to purchase in sufficient detail to enable potential providers to formulate bids." Id. 575. SLD's Service Provider Manual indicates that service providers may provide neutral assistance to applicants as they determine what goods and services to seek. Service Provider Manual, Chapter 5, <http://www.sl.universalservice.org/vendor/manual/chapter5.asp>. Once the applicant enters into an agreement(s) with the service provider(s), the applicant submits an FCC Form 471 to USAC. 47 C.F.R. § 54.504(c). The FCC has stated that applicants cannot abdicate control over the application process to a service provider that is associated with the FCC Form 471 for that applicant. Request for Review by Bethlehem Temple Christian School, Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, Changes to the Board of Directors of the National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc., CC Docket Nos. 96-45, 97-21, DA 01-852 6 (rel. Apr. 6, 2001).

If you believe there is a basis for further examination of your application, you may file an appeal with the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). You should refer to CC Docket No. 02-6 on the first page of your appeal to the FCC. Your appeal must be received or postmarked within 60 days of the above date on this letter. Failure to meet this requirement will result in automatic dismissal of your appeal. If you are submitting your appeal via United States Postal Service, send to: FCC, Office of the Secretary, 445 12<sup>th</sup> Street SW, Washington, DC 20554. Further information and options for filing an appeal directly with the FCC can be found in the "Appeals Procedure" posted in the Reference Area of the SLD web site or by contacting the Client Service Bureau. We strongly recommend that you use the electronic filing options.

We thank you for your continued support, patience, and cooperation during the appeal process.

Schools and Libraries Division  
Universal Service Administrative Company

---

Cc: Dr. Lila Wills Bronson  
Rosemead Elementary School District  
3907 Rosemead Boulevard  
Rosemead, CA 91770

# Attachment 4



**SPECTRUM COMMUNICATIONS**  
**CABLING SERVICES, INC.**

SENT VIA EMAIL AND U.S. MAIL

June 21, 2004

Letter of Appeal  
Schools and Libraries Division  
Box 125 – Correspondence Unit  
80 South Jefferson Road  
Whippany, NJ 07981

RE: Appeal of FCDL for Rosemead Elem. School District dated May 18, 2004

Applicant: Rosemead Elem. School District  
Entity #: 143604  
Form 470: 308530000424460 (Attachment A)  
Form 471: 366569 (Attachment B)  
FRN's #: 996581, 996585, 996593  
Applicant's Form Identifier: Erate6.Int.ConnRebid

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is written to appeal the Schools and Libraries Division, Funding Commitment Decision Letter ('FCDL') dated May 18, 2004, in reference to Rosemead Elem. School District's ('Rosemead') 471 application for E-Rate funding year 2003.

I respectfully ask for reconsideration of the denial and the immediate funding of Rosemead's E-Rate Program Year 6 Internal Connections application for funding year 2003-2004.

Specifically, the Funding Commitment Decision Explanation states the reason for denial:

*'Similarities in Forms 470 and selective review responses among applicants associated with this vendor indicate that the vendor was improperly involved in the competitive bidding process.'* (Attachments C)

The plain interpretation of this explanation implies that our company Spectrum Communications (SPIN 143010165) has been improperly involved with the competitive bidding process which Rosemead undertook for the E-Rate Program Year 6 (2003-2004).

I am unclear as to how or why the SLD believes that my company was improperly involved with the competitive bidding process.

I can however speculate that because the current Year 6 Form 471 is a 're-bid' for Year 5 (Applicant's Form Identifier: Erate6.Int.ConnRebid) it has been presumed that Rosemead did not comply with the bidding requirements set forth by the FCC. In fact, Rosemead did comply with the bidding requirements of the FCC by posting a Form 470 for these projects, waiting 28 days, and reviewing all received bids prior to award.

Rosemead has been denied for all Spectrum requests for Internal Connections for its Year 5 funding request (which are currently under separate appeal), this appeal and circumstances should not be construed as an appeal for Year 5 (2002) funding requests as they are factually dissimilar.

My company responded to Rosemead Elementary School District's Form 470 filing for Year 2003 and provided a total of 25 quotes (note 1) for eligible products and services. Three of these quotes (9008075, 9902102, and 9902514) were denied and are the reason for this appeal.

- Rosemead properly posted its Form 470 application on November 1, 2002. A review of the application, block 10 indicates that Rosemead sought products and services for Internal Connections. Rosemead sought eligible products and services for various sites throughout its district.
- Spectrum provided 25 quotes (note 1) in response to Rosemead's Form 470 Year 6 application.
- Rosemead selected eight of the proposals that Spectrum provided, and after review of the 471 filed, Rosemead selected four proposals by Network Infrastructure Corporation, completing its application for Internal Connections.
- On February 6, 2003, Rosemead executed a contract for products and services with Spectrum Communications (Contract # Rosemead-Spectrum-03-04).
- On February 6, 2003 Rosemead filed timely Form 471 (# 366569).

While Rosemead's application indicated that the three denied proposals by Spectrum Communications are 'reapplications' of previously applied for products and services, our proposals are in fact new quotes which were the result of Rosemead's current 470 application request for program year 2003-2004.

Examination of our previous bids for program year 2002 (Attachments D) indicate that the products and pricing are substantially different than our current proposals for program year 2003 (Attachments E), with the exception of one bid numbered 9902514 (compared to that of Year 5 bid number 9902091) which contains the same pricing because it was the same scope of work, but has a different bid number. The fact that the scope of work did not change from Year 5 to Year 6 is not surprising because Rosemead had at the time of bid required the same scope of work as requested for Year 5. This does not mean that Rosemead did not entertain other bids from other Service Providers and in fact this scope of work was inclusive to the Form 470 application for Year 6.

Note 1: 25 proposals were submitted by Spectrum, however some bids we did not win, were not submitted for funding requests, or were denied because the sites exceed the discount level, and/or the Rosemead decided against performing the work.



I can attest to the fact that neither I nor any representative from Spectrum Communications had any involvement with the selection and or evaluation process for E-Rate applications undertaken by Rosemead.

Simply, my company responded to a solicitation generated by Rosemead's filing of their 470, for their request of Internal Connections, and was subsequently awarded eight of the eleven E-Rate projects.

Clearly the records show that Rosemead's Year 6 (2003) E-Rate request for bids, the bidding process, and the filing for funding was a separate process than that of the previous E-Rate request for Year 5 (2002).

Rosemead's request for a 're-bid' is neither novel nor unique to the E-Rate program, as many applicants who apply for E-Rate funds often requesting similar scopes of work for their new applications because they are unsure when or if their previous applications will be funded.

Rosemead submitted paper work (Attachment F) which specifically indicated that these bids were just that, a re-filing of the same scope of work from the previous unfunded year (Year 5). This statement is required by the SLD in order to ensure that an Applicant does not seek funding for the same scopes of work, funding year to funding year.

Had Rosemead been successful in receiving its Year 5 (2002) application, their statement indicating that Year 6 was a 're-file' would have had the effect of canceling their Year 6 request because of duplication of services. Here it seems that Rosemead has been penalized for making this clear in its Year 6 application and subsequent PIA review(s).

It only stands to reason for Rosemead, who at the time was unaware of the funding status of its previous Year 5 (2002) filing, to 're-file or re-bid' those same services for Year 6 (2003), in hopes to achieve its ultimate technology plans.

I therefore humbly request the SLD grant this appeal and issue a revised FCDL to Rosemead Elementary School District.

Thank you,



Robert Rivera  
President/CEO  
Spectrum Communications

RR:ah  
Attachments

# Attachment 5

# FUNDING COMMITMENT REPORT

Service Provider Name: Spectrum Communications Cabling Services, Inc.  
Service Provider Identification Number: 143010165

Funding Request Number: 996581  
Form 471 Application Number: 366569  
Form 470 Application Number: 308530000424460  
Name of 471 Applicant: ROSEMEAD ELEM SCHOOL DISTRICT  
Applicant Street Address: 3907 ROSEMEAD BLVD  
Applicant City: ROSEMEAD  
Applicant State: CA  
Applicant Zip: 91770-2041  
Entity Number: 143604  
Name of Contact Person: Dr. Lila Wills Bronson  
Preferred Mode of Contact: EMAIL  
Contact Information: lbronson@rosemead.k12.ca.us  
Funding Year: 2003 (07/01/2003 - 06/30/2004)  
Funding Status: Not Funded  
Contract Number: Rosemead-Spectrum 03-04  
Services Ordered: Internal Connections  
Billing Account Number: N/A  
Allowable Vendor Selection/Contract Date: 11/29/2002  
Contract Award Date: 02/01/2003  
Earliest Possible Effective Date of Discount: 07/01/2003  
Contract Expiration Date: 09/30/2004  
Monthly Recurring Charges: \$0.00  
Portion of Monthly Recurring Charges that is Ineligible: \$0.00  
Eligible Monthly Pre-Discount Amount for Recurring Charges: \$0.00  
Number of Months Recurring Service Provided in Funding Year: 12  
Annual Pre-Discount Amount for Eligible Recurring Charges: \$0.00  
Annual Non-Recurring Charges: \$96273.73  
Portion of Annual Non-Recurring Charges that is Ineligible: \$0.00  
Annual Pre-Discount Amount for Eligible Non-Recurring Charges: \$96273.73  
Total Program Year Pre-Discount Amount: \$96273.73  
Applicant's Approved Discount Percentage: N/A  
Funding Commitment Decision: \$0.00 - Bidding Violation  
Funding Commitment Decision Explanation: Similarities in Forms 470 and selective review responses among applicants associated with this vendor indicate that the vendor was improperly involved in the competitive bidding process.  
Technology Plan Approval Status: Approved  
Wave Number: 029  
Applicant Letter Date: 05/18/2004

FUNDING COMMITMENT REPORT

Service Provider Name: Spectrum Communications Cabling Services, Inc.  
Service Provider Identification Number: 143010165

Funding Request Number: 996585  
Form 471 Application Number: 366569  
Form 470 Application Number: 308530000424460  
Name of 471 Applicant: ROSEMEAD ELEM SCHOOL DISTRICT  
Applicant Street Address: 3907 ROSEMEAD BLVD  
Applicant City: ROSEMEAD  
Applicant State: CA  
Applicant Zip: 91770-2041  
Entity Number: 143604  
Name of Contact Person: Dr. Lila Wills Bronson  
Preferred Mode of Contact: EMAIL  
Contact Information: lbronson@rosemead.k12.ca.us  
Funding Year: 2003 (07/01/2003 - 06/30/2004)  
Funding Status: Not Funded  
Contract Number: Rosemead-Spectrum 03-04  
Services Ordered: Internal Connections  
Billing Account Number: N/A  
Allowable Vendor Selection/Contract Date: 11/29/2002  
Contract Award Date: 02/01/2003  
Earliest Possible Effective Date of Discount: 07/01/2003  
Contract Expiration Date: 09/30/2004  
Monthly Recurring Charges: \$0.00  
Portion of Monthly Recurring Charges that is Ineligible: \$0.00  
Eligible Monthly Pre-Discount Amount for Recurring Charges: \$0.00  
Number of Months Recurring Service Provided in Funding Year: 12  
Annual Pre-Discount Amount for Eligible Recurring Charges: \$0.00  
Annual Non-Recurring Charges: \$1348.51  
Portion of Annual Non-Recurring Charges that is Ineligible: \$0.00  
Annual Pre-Discount Amount for Eligible Non-Recurring Charges: \$1348.51  
Total Program Year Pre-Discount Amount: \$1348.51  
Applicant's Approved Discount Percentage: N/A  
Funding Commitment Decision: \$0.00 - Bidding Violation  
Funding Commitment Decision Explanation: Similarities in Forms 470 and selective review responses among applicants associated with this vendor indicate that the vendor was improperly involved in the competitive bidding process.  
Technology Plan Approval Status: Approved  
Wave Number: 029  
Applicant Letter Date: 05/18/2004

# FUNDING COMMITMENT REPORT

Service Provider Name: Spectrum Communications Cabling Services, Inc.  
Service Provider Identification Number: 143010165

Funding Request Number: 996593  
Form 471 Application Number: 366569  
Form 470 Application Number: 308530000424460  
Name of 471 Applicant: ROSEMEAD ELEM SCHOOL DISTRICT  
Applicant Street Address: 3907 ROSEMEAD BLVD  
Applicant City: ROSEMEAD  
Applicant State: CA  
Applicant Zip: 91770-2041  
Entity Number: 143604  
Name of Contact Person: Dr. Lila Wills Bronson  
Preferred Mode of Contact: EMAIL  
Contact Information: lbronson@rosemead.k12.ca.us  
Funding Year: 2003 (07/01/2003 - 06/30/2004)  
Funding Status: Not Funded  
Contract Number: Rosemead-Spectrum 03-04  
Services Ordered: Internal Connections  
Billing Account Number: N/A  
Allowable Vendor Selection/Contract Date: 11/29/2002  
Contract Award Date: 02/01/2003  
Earliest Possible Effective Date of Discount: 07/01/2003  
Contract Expiration Date: 09/30/2004  
Monthly Recurring Charges: \$0.00  
Portion of Monthly Recurring Charges that is Ineligible: \$0.00  
Eligible Monthly Pre-Discount Amount for Recurring Charges: \$0.00  
Number of Months Recurring Service Provided in Funding Year: 12  
Annual Pre-Discount Amount for Eligible Recurring Charges: \$0.00  
Annual Non-Recurring Charges: \$10575.60  
Portion of Annual Non-Recurring Charges that is Ineligible: \$0.00  
Annual Pre-Discount Amount for Eligible Non-Recurring Charges: \$10575.60  
Total Program Year Pre-Discount Amount: \$10575.60  
Applicant's Approved Discount Percentage: N/A  
Funding Commitment Decision: \$0.00 - Bidding Violation  
Funding Commitment Decision Explanation: Similarities in Forms 470 and selective review responses among applicants associated with this vendor indicate that the vendor was improperly involved in the competitive bidding process.  
Technology Plan Approval Status: Approved  
Wave Number: 029  
Applicant Letter Date: 05/18/2004

# Attachment 6

## **California Technology Plan Certification For E-rate**

The California Department of Education (CDE) has delegated authority to approve district E-rate technology plans to county offices of education (COE). COEs will review, approve, certify and retain technology plans for school districts in their jurisdiction.

Approved Technology Plans should cover a period of not more than three years. Long-range planning is important for the effective use of information technology in schools and libraries. All approved plans should include provisions for evaluating progress toward the plan's goals, and ideally these assessments should occur on an annual basis. There may be cases in which an approved plan is longer than three years to conform to federal, state, or local requirements. Whenever an approved plan is longer than three years, there should be a significant review of progress during the third year.

In light of the dynamic nature of this field, technology plans should undergo periodic revision to take advantage of new hardware, software, and telecommunication opportunities. As school or library staff become more proficient in the use of these information technologies, new education and library service improvement possibilities are also likely to emerge. A technology plan should be responsive to these opportunities, open to revision, and not a static document. Technology plan revisions should also be sent to the COE E-rate coordinator to keep the files up to date.

To find the COE E-rate contact view:

<http://www.sl.universalservice.org/reference/tech/default.asp> or contact your COE.

For the Schools and Libraries reference on technology plans view:

<http://www.sl.universalservice.org/apply/step2.asp>.

Districts should submit E-rate technology plans to the COE E-rate coordinator for approval. Then the COE will mail signed certification forms and checklists to:

California Department of Education – Education Technology Office  
1430 N Street, Suite 6308  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 323-5263  
Fax (916) 323-5110  
Attn: E-rate Technology Plan Certification

COE technology plans are to be mailed or emailed ([astampfl@cde.ca.gov](mailto:astampfl@cde.ca.gov)) to the CDE for review and approval.

Taken from: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/et/ft/techplanning.asp>  
Last modified: Monday, May 03, 2004

## E-rate: Technology Planning Guide

Guidelines on how to submit a technology plan for districts and schools.

E-rate requires approved technology plans as a prerequisite for receiving Internet access or internal connections discounts. The three-year E-rate technology plan has five approval criteria:

1. The plan must establish clear goals and a realistic strategy for using telecommunication and information technology to improve education or library services.
2. The plan must have a professional development strategy to ensure that staff know how to use these new technologies to improve education or library services.
3. The plan must include an assessment of the telecommunication services, hardware, software, and other services that will be needed to improve education or library services.
4. The plan must provide for a sufficient budget to acquire and maintain the hardware and software.
5. The plan must include an evaluation process that enables the school or library to monitor the program.

*Education Code* Section 51871.5(a) also requires school districts to have an Education Technology Plan Certification Form on file with the California Department of Education (CDE) in order to be eligible to receive any education technology funds administered by the CDE. If a school district has an approved E-rate technology plan, both the E-rate and the *Education Code* Section 51871.5(a) requirements are met. By developing a technology plan in accordance with the guidelines outlined in the Education Technology Planning Guide (PDF; 781KB; 104pp.) and submitting the plan to your county office of education for E-rate approval, both requirements are met.

**Questions: Wayne Shimizu | [wshimizu@cde.ca.gov](mailto:wshimizu@cde.ca.gov) | 916-322-5894**



# Attachment 7

Taken from: <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/et/ft/eratetraining.asp>

Last modified: Monday, May 03, 2004

## E-rate: Training Material

Experienced trainers from the CDE, DGS, and CPUC, local education agencies, and telephone companies will share their knowledge and experience.

The California Department of Education (CDE), in conjunction with the California Technology Assistance Project (CTAP), California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), California Department of General Services (DGS), public school E-rate leaders, and corporate E-rate experts, is offering an E-rate workshop to help applicants prepare for E-rate Funding Year 2004. The E-rate Year 2004 cycle has started, and it is time for applicants to gear up. The training is designed for new and novice E-rate applicants. Experienced applicants will also benefit from new information about E-rate and California Teleconnect Fund (CTF) telecommunications discount programs. The objective of the training is to assist E-rate and CTF applicants to develop successful applications and to maximize telecommunications discounts. The training will be conducted at selected county office of education sites; video conferencing technology will be used to allow other sites to participate. Experienced trainers from the CDE, DGS, and CPUC, local education agencies, and telephone companies will share their knowledge and experience.

**If you miss a workshop you can still view an archived version on the Web site at [www.sdcce.tv/archives.asp](http://www.sdcce.tv/archives.asp). On this page, select the meeting you would like to view.**

### Agenda

- Overview of E-rate and CTF
- Completing the E-rate Form 470
- Completing the E-rate Form 471
- What to do after you get your funding commitment
- California procurement options
- What vendors can and cannot do in the E-rate program
- Managing your phone bills
- Preparing documentation for audits and reviews
- Program updates
- Application strategies

### You should attend this E-rate training if:

- You are not currently participating in E-rate and CTF
- You need information about completing the E-rate forms
- You want information about the E-rate application cycle
- You want information about new E-rate and CTF program changes that will affect your upcoming applications

Technology, business office, and administrative staff who have responsibility for filing E-rate applications will benefit from the information being offered in these workshops.

**Questions: Wayne Shimizu | [wshimizu@cde.ca.gov](mailto:wshimizu@cde.ca.gov) | 916-322-5894**

# Attachment 8

# *Filing the E-rate Form 470 Online*

***California E-rate/CTF Training Collaborative***

***Objectives of the Online Form 470 Workshop***

---

- To provide participants with information about preparing to file E-rate Form 470 via the Internet
- To help participants understand requirements for procurement of products and services
- To demonstrate the online Form 470 to help participants understand the process for completing the Form 470
- To provide information about preparation preparing to file the Form 471

**Why file an E-rate Form 470?**

The purpose of the Form 470 is to initiate a competitive bidding process for the eligible services desired. The intent is to allow for an open and fair competitive process to select the most cost-effective provider of the desired services. This is the first form that must be filed by a school district or library in the E-Rate application process. The Form 470's purpose is to briefly describe the applicant school district, provide a point of contact, and identify telecommunications and technology services that the applicant will be seeking. Much of the information requested on the form 470 is made available to potential vendors.

**File early so you can make changes or correct information if needed (see E rate timeline in the reference material).**

***Items to consider before filing your 470.***

---

- Form a team of business, facilities, curriculum, information technology and school site representatives to develop a integrated E-rate application and technology plan.
- Calculate the E-rate discount (see reference material on CD)
  - Count the number of students eligible for Free and Reduced Priced Lunches
  - Free and Reduced Price Lunch data are available on the California Department of Education (CDE) Web site.  
(<http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sh/cw/filesafdc.asp> or <http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/>). These data describe the number of students served.
    - There are alternate ways to calculate the number of students eligible for the Free and Reduced Price Lunch program  
(<http://www.sl.universalservice.org/reference/Discount.asp>)
  - Determine if your site(s) are designated rural or urban. Go to <http://www.sl.universalservice.org/reference/msa/RuralUrbanClassYr4.asp> to find out which Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) codes are designated urban or rural
  - Find the MSA code of the site(s) at <http://www.ffiec.gov/geocode/default.htm>
  - Strategies for increasing your E-rate discount
    - Make sure the Free and Reduced Price Lunch data posted on the Web site are accurate
    - Have your schools encourage reporting of Free and Reduced Price Lunch students via events, communications, incentives
    - Assign staff to manage Free and Reduced Price Lunch data
    - Conduct income surveys if appropriate

- Decide on your E-rate application strategy
  - Determine which of the telecommunications services will you apply for discounts (i.e., telecommunications, Internet access, internal connections).
  - Broadly describe the scope of services for which you will be applying for services, using Eligible Services List as a reference (<http://www.sl.universalservice.org/reference/eligible.asp>). Even though you broadly describe services on the Form 470, you must still have sufficient details about your acquisition to meet applicable local procurement requirements
  - File one Form 470
  - Apply for Telecommunications and Internet access discounts
  - Consider your discount rate before applying for Internal connections discounts
- Things you will need for the Form 470:
  - The name of the person who will be responsible for questions about the E-rate application
  - The name of the person who will be responsible for questions about services being requested
  - Input from the purchasing and business departments to understand state and local procurement rules and policies
  - Area codes and telephone prefix number of schools/libraries receiving services
  - The name of entity that pays the bill and the entity number (Contact the SLD if you do not find your entity on the Web site (<http://www.sl.universalservice.org/reference/entity.asp>))
  - Restrictions that you want to place on vendors reading your Form 470 (e.g., CMAS vendors only, geographic restrictions, etc.)
  - E-rate process timelines for the funding year (see reference materials on CD)



- Superintendent and/or Board approval to submit the E-rate application and commitment to the non-discounted portion of the services
- Education technology plan
  - E-rate tech plan must address the five areas
    - Goals and objectives for improving education or library services
    - Professional development
    - Infrastructure
    - Funding and budgeting
    - Monitoring and evaluation
  - The districts should develop 3-5 year tech plans that meet E-rate criteria
  - Submit the technology plan to your County Office of Education (COE). The COE will review and if the plan addressed the five criteria then approve the plan
  - The COE will certify to the CDE that a district's tech plan is approved
  - If you are a COE the CDE will review your E-rate technology plan
  - The CDE posts the certification on the Web site (See <http://www.cde.ca.gov/erate> for status of your E-rate tech plan posted on the CDE Web page)
  - Check SLD Web site for the information about your COE E-rate technology plan approver  
(<http://www.sl.universalservice.org/reference/tech/default.asp>)
  - Services for which you are requested must be within the scope of the technology plans
  - Develop one education technology plan that serves multiple purposes (E-rate, Education Code, grant requirements)